

REMARKS

This is in full and timely response to the non-final Office Action mailed on August 14, 2003. Reexamination in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 50-79 are currently pending in this application, with claims 50 and 79 being independent. No new matter has been added.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103

Claims 1-8, 12, 14, 16-21, 23-24, 26, 28-33, 35-40, 42-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,768,456 to Knapp et al. (Knapp).

Claims 9-11, 22, 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being allegedly obvious over Knapp.

Claims 13, 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being allegedly obvious over Knapp in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,434,297 to Althaus et al. (Althaus).

Claims 15, 27, 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being allegedly obvious over Knapp in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,073,041 to Rastani.

These rejections are traversed at least for the following

reasons.

While not conceding the propriety of this rejection and in order to advance the prosecution of the above-identified application, claims 1-49 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of their underlying subject matter. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Newly added claims

Claim 50 and the claims dependent thereon, and claim 79 include the features of:

an optical lens array including a lens substrate made from an optical material and having a plurality of convex portions extending therefrom, a convex portion of the plurality of convex portions having a convex shape and comprising a material the same as that of the lens substrate,

the lens substrate having a mask layer on the surface thereof, the mask layer comprising a material different than that of the lens substrate,

a height of the convex portion being specified on the basis of a thickness of the mask layer.

Support is provided, at least, within figures 3A-3D and their associated disclosure within the specification as originally filed.

Knapp arguably teaches an optoelectronic package having convex portion 140 and lens substrate 142 (figure 4). However, Knapp fails to disclose, teach or suggest the height of the convex portion 142 being specified on the basis of a thickness of a mask layer.

Rastani arguably teaches an integrated assembly having a lens substrate 22. However, Rastani fails to disclose, teach or suggest a convex portion (figures 2 and 5). Moreover, Rastani fails to disclose, teach or suggest the height of a convex portion being specified on the basis of a thickness of a mask layer.

Althaus arguably teaches an optical system having a lens substrate 2 and a convex portion 7 (figures 1-2). Althaus arguably teaches a mask layer 13 (figure 3). Nevertheless, Althaus fails to disclose, teach or suggest the height of a convex portion 11 being specified on the basis of a thickness of the mask layer 13. Allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.


Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, all the claims now pending in the present application are allowable, and the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reexamination and reconsideration of the application in light of the amendments and remarks is courteously solicited.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone Brian K. Dutton, Reg. No. 47,255, at 202-955-8753, or the undersigned attorney.

If any fee is required or any overpayment made, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee or credit the overpayment to Deposit Account # 18-0013.

Respectfully submitted,



Ronald P. Kananen
Reg. No. 24,104

DATE: September 30, 2003

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
Lion Building
Suite 501
1233 20th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: (202) 955-3750
Fax: (202) 955-3751
Customer No. 23353